

MARTIN

Received & Inspected

NOV 04 2008

FCC Mail Room

Division of Finance and Administration  
224 Administration Building  
Martin, Tennessee 38238  
Office: 731.881.7800  
Fax: 731.881.7967

ORIGINAL

October 27, 2008

The Honorable Kevin J. Martin  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-B201  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Michael J. Copps  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-B115  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-A302  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Deborah Taylor Tate  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-A204  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Robert M. McDowell  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-C302  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Universal Service Contribution Methodology  
WC Docket No. 06-122  
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service  
CC Docket No. 96-45

**Written Ex Parte Communication**

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing on behalf of The University of Tennessee at Martin in response to reports that the FCC is considering a proposal to change the current system for determining the amount of contributions to the federal Universal Service Fund. As I understand this proposal, the FCC intends to base contributions to the fund from residential customers on how many telephone numbers are assigned to each carrier's customers, to retain the current revenue-based contribution mechanism for commercial customers, including colleges and universities, and to request comments on whether to modify the contribution system for commercial customers in the future. Further, it appears that the proposal rejects a suggestion by AT&T and Verizon that all contributions, including those from commercial customers, should be based on telephone number assignments. For the reasons described below, The University of Tennessee at Martin believes that the FCC should not adopt any modification that uses telephone numbers to calculate commercial customers' contributions to the federal Universal Service Fund, and that the FCC should retain the current revenues-based system for commercial services until it can devise a system that does not impose an inequitable burden on large users of telephone numbers, including colleges and universities.

Any change in the contribution mechanism that depends solely on counting telephone numbers, without accounting for the way those numbers are used, would have a significant negative effect on colleges and universities because it would increase their universal service costs significantly. For instance, the

No. of Copies rec'd 043  
List ABCDE

AT&T/Verizon proposal would impose a uniform fee for each assigned telephone number in the U.S., a fee that they estimate would range from \$1.00 to \$1.10 per month. This fee would be assessed regardless of how many calls were made to or from a number and, in fact, regardless of whether the number actually was used at all. Colleges and universities typically use many telephone numbers to serve their faculty, staff and students. Even relatively small campuses can use thousands of numbers, and the largest state universities are assigned tens of thousands of numbers at any given time. As a consequence, the net effect of adopting the AT&T/Verizon approach to universal service contributions would be to increase the burden of those contributions on colleges and universities significantly. ACUTA, the Association for Information Communications Technology Professionals in Higher Education, has calculated that, at a rate of \$1.00 per number per month the average college or university would see its universal service contribution rise under the AT&T/Verizon proposal to nearly eight times the current level, from an average of more than \$13,000 a year to an average of about \$100,000 a year. In the case of The University of Tennessee at Martin the increase would be from approximately \$20,000 a year to \$120,000 a year.


This additional financial burden would be particularly onerous at this time. As you are aware, the current economic situation makes it difficult for colleges and universities to cover increased costs in any area. In addition, tuition increases are limited by both practical considerations and new mandates in the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, enacted over the summer. As a result, any increased universal service costs would have to be covered by reducing expenditures in other areas under already-tight budgets.

Retaining the current revenue-based system for calculating contributions for commercial services will avoid imposing this burden on colleges and universities, as well as other users that have many telephone numbers assigned to them, but will not prevent the Commission from reforming the contribution mechanism for consumer services. Maintaining the current system for commercial customers also will give the Commission the time to analyze and evaluate alternatives that can address the issues caused by revenue-based contributions without placing a disproportionate burden on non-profit colleges and universities. For instance, the Commission could recognize that the burden placed on the telephone network by large consumers of telephone numbers is not proportional to how many numbers are assigned to those customers, and adopt equivalency ratios like those that are now in place for the subscriber line charge. Regardless of the approach the Commission ultimately takes, it should ensure that colleges and universities do not experience the kind of rate shock that would result from adoption of a system based solely on number assignments, and should ensure that the potential customer impacts of any new contribution methodology are addressed before the new methodology is adopted.

In accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, four copies of this letter are being filed with the Secretary's office on this date.

Please inform me if any questions should arise in connection with this letter.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Alvin C. Hooten  
Vice Chancellor for  
Finance & Administration

C Nicholas Alexander  
Scott Bergmann  
Scott Deutchman  
James Lande  
Mark McAlpin  
Greg Orlando  
Thomas Rakes  
Cindy Spiers

Amy Bender  
Shannon Burgin  
Daniel Gonzalez  
Jeremy Marcus  
Alexander Minard  
Carol Pomponio  
Dana Shaffer  
Office of the Secretary (4 copies)